

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 13, 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The examiner states that the applicant has not mentioned or disclosed “additional parts do not comprise image data already sent in said representative part” in the specification. The applicants respectfully disagree. In the applicants’ specification, the numerous embodiments of the applicants’ currently-claimed invention are described with respect to image data encoded with scalable coder/decoders, see for example, pages 13-14, “Streaming Selected Portions of the Codestream” related to JPEG 2000. Inherent to scalability is that portions of encoded data need only be sent once and additional parts do not comprise data previously transmitted. This rejection of claims 1, 13, 21 and 24 should be withdrawn.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sivan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,281,874, (hereinafter referred to as Sivan et al.).

Claim 3 has been canceled.

Sivan et al. teaches a method wherein a low-resolution version of an image is maintained in a separate file from a high-resolution version of the image (column 4, lines 21-30). The methods of Sivan et al. require additional storage space to store two files wherein the low-resolution file is redundant data that is already stored in the high-resolution file, i.e., the low-resolution data in the low-resolution file can be generated from the high-resolution data in the high-resolution file. Sivan et al. teaches that the low-resolution data is low-pass filtered or sub-sampled from the high-resolution data, thereby creating redundant data (col. 4, lines 28-30). This is a waste of storage space and a waste of transmission bandwidth when redundant data is transmitted.

Sivan et al. teach a method wherein a low-resolution image file is transmitted to a client. The client then selects a portion from the image corresponding to the low-resolution file. A portion of the high-resolution file corresponding to the user’s selection is then transmitted to the client. The high-resolution, transmitted image is displayed at the client, in some cases by

overlaying a pseudo-zoomed version of the low-resolution image (column 6, lines 36-48) or in other cases, by replacing the low-resolution image already displayed (column 3, lines 15-17). This is not a combination of the data transmitted for the low-resolution image and the data transmitted for the high-resolution image, but merely a display technique to provide feedback to the viewer at the client display.

In some embodiments described in Sivan et al., a difference image is transmitted. The difference image corresponds to the difference between the high-resolution image and the pseudo-zoomed version of the low-resolution image (column 8, lines 14-22). The high-resolution image at the client, may be generated, in these embodiments, by the combination of the difference image and the pseudo-zoomed version of the low-resolution image. In these embodiments, Sivan et al. does not disclose combining portions of the image file transmitted from a server to a client in separate transmissions. The difference image as disclosed by Sivan et al. is not part of the image file from which the low-resolution image was obtained.

Embodiments of the applicants' currently-claimed invention, comprise image transmission methods and systems in which a first set of integral data units in an image file is transmitted from a server to a client. The first set of integral data units in the image file contains a representation of the image. A customization of the image is requested from the server by the client based on the representation of the image, and the server then determines, by parsing the image file, which additional integral data units in the image file are required at the client such that when combined with the first set of integral data units, the combination of initial and additional integral data units will yield the desired customization. For example, the initial set of integral data units in the image file may correspond to a first set of bytes contained in the image file. The additional set of integral data units in the image file may correspond to a second set of bytes contained in the image file. The first set of bytes and second set of bytes do not contain any bytes in common from the image file. The first set of bytes contains a representation of the image from which a customization may be selected at the client. The combination of the two sets of bytes contains the requested customization.

Sivan et al. does not teach, nor does any combination of previously cited prior art teach, separately transmitting to a client distinct sets of integral data units from a single image file that may be combined at the client to form a customized image. Independent claims 1, 13, 21 and 24 have been amended to more clearly distinguish these elements of the applicants' invention from that of Sivan et al. and all combinations of previously cited prior art. These independent claims and their respective dependent claims are now patentable in their amended form.

The examiner has rejected claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,281,874, (hereinafter referred to as Sivan et al.), in view of Li, J. et al., ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29, WG1 N1473, February 1999, (hereinafter referred to as Li et al.). Claims 4 and 6 are dependent on claim 1 and therefore incorporate all limitations therein. Since Li et al. does not disclose parsing an image file to determine an additional set of integral data units in the image file to be separately transmitted from an initial set of integral data units to a client so that these separate parts of a single image file may be combined at the client to form a customized image, under the arguments above, the combination of Sivan et al. and Li et al. does not disclose these limitations and does not render claims 4 and 6 obvious.

The examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,281,874, (hereinafter referred to as Sivan et al.), in view of Duhault et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,900,868, (hereinafter referred to as Duhault et al.). Claim 5 is canceled.

The examiner has rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,281,874, (hereinafter referred to as Sivan et al.), in view of Li, C. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,345,279, (hereinafter referred to as Li, C. et al.). Claims 10 and 11 are dependent on claim 1 and therefore incorporate all limitations therein. Since Li, C. et al. does not disclose parsing an image file to determine an additional set of integral data units in the image file to be separately transmitted from an initial set of integral data units to a client so that these separate parts of a single image file may be combined at the client to form a customized image, under the arguments above, the combination of Sivan et al. and Li, C. et al. does not disclose these limitations and does not render claims 10 and 11 obvious.

The examiner has rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,281,874, (hereinafter referred to as Sivan et al.), in view of Duhault et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,900,868, (hereinafter referred to as Duhault et al.), in further view of Li, J. et al., ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29, WG1 N1473, February 1999, (hereinafter referred to as Li et al.). Claims 17 and 18 are dependent on claim 13 and therefore incorporate all limitations therein. Since neither Duhault et al. nor Li et al., either separately or in combination, disclose parsing an image file to determine an additional set of integral data units in the image file to be separately transmitted from an initial set of integral data units to a client so that these separate data units of a single image file may be combined at the client to form a customized image, under the arguments above, the combination of Sivan et al., Duhault et al. and Li et al. does not render claims 17 and 18 obvious.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott C. Krieger/

Scott C. Krieger

Reg. No. 42,768

Tel No.: (360) 828-0589